

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 were pending, examined, and rejected. The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/001385 A1 (Janik) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,829,473 (Keller). In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2. Claims 1-12 remain pending.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janik in view of Keller.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant has amended to recite that the buffer memory includes a receive buffer and a transmit buffer and that the apparatus includes a switchable connection for transmitting data from the transmit buffer to the receive buffer. Applicants submit that Claim 1 as amended is patentable over the cited references because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements. A Section 103(a) rejection is proper only when the cited references teach or suggest all claim elements.

The cited references fail to teach or suggest, for example, a switchable connection between a transmit buffer and a receive buffer of an input/output port. The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Janik does not teach or suggest hardware elements. Although Keller teaches an input/output port having a receive buffer and a transmit buffer, Keller does not teach or suggest a switchable connection for transmitting data from the transmit buffer to the receive buffer. To the contrary, Keller expressly teaches away from such a connection. Keller, for example, teaches a “system control signal places the circuitry in either the ‘read mode,’ i.e., receiving or write mode, i.e., transmitting. The UART port 69 circuitry typically does not timeshare receive and transmit functions.” Column 4, lines 20-24. Thus, Keller clearly teaches away from a connection switchable to transfer data between its receive and transmit buffers. Because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant

respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 1 as amended and its dependent claims.

With respect to independent Claim 7, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the cited references do not teach or suggest the method as claimed in which a transmit buffer and receive buffer are operably connected to allow the passage of data therebetween. Again, Janik does not teach or suggest hardware elements and, although Keller teaches an input/output port having a receive buffer and a transmit buffer, Keller teaches away from a connection between receive and transmit buffers as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 7 its dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this paper contains a reply to each ground of objection and rejection set forth in the Office Action. In light of the amendments made herein and the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant would request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections, allow the pending claims, and advance the application to issue. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or

suggestions, the undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference at 512.428.9872.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. P. Lally", written in a cursive style.

Joseph P. Lally

Reg. No. 38,947

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

LALLY & LALLY, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 684749
Austin, Texas 78768-4749
512.428.9870
512.428.9871 (FAX)

JPL/mmm